Info-Hams Digest   Sun, 25 Jul 93   Volume 93 : Issue 896

Today's Topics:
                    Amateur Radio public service
                           ftp ham sites
                     historic question (2 msgs)
                 How does an American sign in Canada?
             INFO NEEDED: Lunar VHF Amplifier (2 msgs)
               Need Macintosh Compatible ".Z" Decode
                            QSL routes
       STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (2 msgs)
                           TS50 Illegal!
                   VE Test Conditions (2 msgs)

Date: 22 Jul 93 16:58:21 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Amateur Radio public service
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

  I've seen a couple of messages relating to, "Who needs Amateur Radio for
public service communications, when the police, fire, emergency management
and other agencies now have reliable, high-tech equipment and good
operators?"

  Here's my comment du jour:

  The above is almost true, except that most towns, cities, counties and

states don't have the money or resources to conduct exercises--and even real
emergency operations--with dozens (or hundreds) of trained operators, who
mostly get paid...and overtime on weekends, evenings and holidays!

   If you were an official responsible for some public service agency, how
would you feel if approached by a recognized nonprofit community group that
offered a large number of trained, competent communications specialists, each
equipped with his/her own radio gear, and all willing to participate for FREE
at almost any time, 24 hours, 365 days a week? And they could operate voice,
code, packet, RTTY, ATV and more on bands from 1.8 to above 1200 GHz?

   I believe that if this is the main thrust of a proposal to offer Amateur
Radio services to a local/state government official, he or she would be
foolish to turn it down. And even more so when you, as a tax-paying member of
that community, went before the next government meeting to state that you were
very disappointed that Official X turned down such an offer!

   Just some thoughts...

CUL es 73 de BB

 ""
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I great frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I
 ""
 ""
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I great frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I
 ""
                                                                              .

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 06:25:33 GMT
From: olivea!pagesat!ukma!eng.ufl.edu!usenet.ufl.edu!mailer.cc.fsu.edu!
freenet.scri.fsu.edu!ferrell@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ftp ham sites
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

...DOUG
KD4MOJ
ferrell@freenet.scri.fsu.edu
--

Date: 23 Jul 93 19:46:59 GMT
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!cupnews0.cup.hp.com!
jholly@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: historic question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

David Adams (dadams@cray.com) wrote:
: In browsing through the July issue of QST I notice (p. 101 under 75 years ago)

: "July 1918 -- QST, like US Amateur Radio itself, remains shut down for the
: duration oof World War I."

Not sure why it shut down in WWI, but most likely because everyone was
basically on the same wavelength.

: Why was Amateur Radio shut down in WWI? Fear of Espionage? Why was it
: not shut down in other wars?

say what? Amateur Radio was off the air before the sun set on Dec 7, 1941.
remained off untill a couple months after the 'big' one. WWII was the last
'war' that the US fought, the others were police actions.

: ---
: David, N0WWN/AA
:   November Zero Wiskey Wiskey November
: --David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com
:   -Sourdough and Ham-   - Minnesotans for Global Warming! -
:   (&gardner)

Jim, WA6SDM
jholly@cup.hp.com

Date: 23 Jul 93 21:02:42 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!gatech!ukma!hgpeach@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: historic question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

>In browsing through the July issue of QST I notice (p. 101 under 75 years ago)

>"July 1918 -- QST, like US Amateur Radio itself, remains shut down for the
>duration oof World War I."

During World War I the Department of Commerce banned all non-military

transmitting AND RECEIVING. At that time radio was a relatively new technology
and I am sure was banned for many reasons.

Just a short plug for the League. If it had not been for HPM and the ARRL
it is doubtful that amateur radio would have existed in the post-WWI radio
world. After the war and partly because of it, radio moved out of the
experimental realm and hams became a pain to commercial and later broadcast
stations.

73, Harold, N4FLZ

P.S. While talking history, it is interesting to note that no one really
      ever considered the emergency/public service uses of amateur radio
      until after a great flood in the Ohio Valley during 1935 or 1936.
      To hear some talk of it now you would think that was why we where
      founded - in fact that did not become a part of our mission until
      almost 25 years after the fact!
--
Harold G. Peach, Jr.   ><>   N4FLZ   _%   hgpeach@s.ms.uky.edu

----

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 93 19:11:56 GMT
From: cs.ubc.ca!alberta!adec23!mark@beaver.cs.washington.edu
Subject: How does an American sign in Canada?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:

>As an Extra-class operator, do I operate under the Canadian segmentation(or
>the lack of it), or am I still constrained by the American band segments?

You are constrained by both laws. ie, you can not operate outside any
Canadian band (ie, Canadians do not have anything above 450MHz on the
70cm band) AND you must observe all your US band and mode requirements
(you can not use phone on 14.14MHz) for your class of license.

>How do the other license classes translate to operation in Canada?

They don't, that is the point.

Ciao -- 73 de VE6MGS/Mark

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 21:05:23 GMT
From: psinntp!eta.se.atk.com!mvanripe@uunet.uu.net
Subject: INFO NEEDED: Lunar VHF Amplifier

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 21:08:22 GMT
From: psinntp!eta.se.atk.com!mvanripe@uunet.uu.net
Subject: INFO NEEDED: Lunar VHF Amplifier
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 23:11:25 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
pv6f14.vincent.iastate.edu!jeffries@network.ucsd.
Subject: Need Macintosh Compatible ".Z" Decode
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <9307221516.AA29623@aud.alcatel.com> NIX@bigbrd.AUd.alcatel.COM (Paul) writes:

>Can somebody please tell me where I can find a Macintosh compatible
>program that'll decode the ".Z" compressed "Info-Hams" Mail Archives?

Paul,

The program you are looking for is "Maccompress". It *should* be available
from wuarchive.wustl.edu. Maybe you've already tried this, but if you have
access to a UNIX system, you could try the "uncompress" command on the file.
Also, I usually transfer .Z'd files as binaries, instead of text.

I hope this helps.

(For the curious, my call is N0NRO.)
--
Anthony Glen Jeffries
Journalism and Mass Communication student
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa
jeffries@iastate.edu

Date: 23 Jul 93 14:50:10 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-
for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: QSL routes
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

v111qheg@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu (P.VASILION) asks:

>Need QSL info for

>V26AS (ARRL DX Feb '93)
>FY0EK (Feb '92)
>7L1GVE (most sure route, pse)

>Vice President, Western NY DX Assoc.
>Editor, _WNYDXA REPORT_

Wait a minute - you are VP of a DX Association and editor of a DX report,
and you don't have a copy of the "GO list"? These routes are all in the
latest issue (#158).   Even we Medium Pistols subscribe to this.

This might be an unfair response, and you already know that these routes
are not the ones you need, so I won't waste everyone's time by typing them
in.

Gd dx to u es ur family es qsl sure via buro,

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 23 Jul 1993 07:02 EDT
From: crash!newshub.nosc.mil!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!ncar!uchinews!cs.umd.edu!
skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!@news.cerf.net
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1786@arrl.org>, bjahnke@arrl.org (Bart Jahnke) writes...
>

[stuff deleted]

>And yes, each answer sheet, code copy sheet, 610, CSCE (previous and current),
>and any other document(s) for each applicant are reviewed. Nearly each
>license copy has to be trimmed and attached to the 610, as the FCC requires.
>Attendance averages twelve applicants per session, with a routine number

>of sessions including 25 to 40 applicants or more.
>
>A file is then created for test forms. Session summary results are entered
>into a computer. The VE Team's credentials are verified. An FCC summary
>form is created/copied for forwarding/filing. And so on...
>
>Year around, we probably average four to six days processing time.
>Sometimes more, per above, and sometimes less. As for us turning
>an exam the same day received, we'd like to do that--but
>we aren't able to do so at present. Of course, whenever
>the FCC goes beyond six weeks themselves, one-third of our staff
>find themselves answering inquiries from applicants regarding the
>whereabouts of their license. This is often six to seven weeks into the
>process. We would be glad to have those staff members processing
>sessions too...
>
>Informationally, we have given each ARRL VE Team (and VE) an information
>sheet--that they are to hand out to applicants--which covers the typical
>wait for a license (specified at about ten weeks from the test date). We
>verbally indicate eight to ten weeks to callers.
>
>The FCC quotes 90 days. If an inquiry is made by an applicant to
>the FCC before 90 days have elapsed, the FCC will sometimes advise that
>the caller check back at 90 days--or, if the license has not been issued,
>they will review their computer records and, if nothing is found, they
>will give their *standard* response, "We have no record of that application!"
>
>Great response, eh? Well, the FCC only records on their computer
>the fact that an application is at their facility when it is actually
>keyboarded.
>
>When is it keyboarded? The 2nd to the last step in their process--which
>is on a Tuesday (about five to seven weeks after they have received).
>
>What is the last step? Two days later (the same week, on that Thursday), the
>license is laser printed and mailed. You then receive it via first-class mail
>within the next few days.
>
>73,
>
>Bart J. Jahnke, KB9NM
>Manager
>ARRL/VEC

Both the VECs and the FCC makes poor to no use of computing facilities.

1) In all cases computers could be used by the VE to enter the test
result information in the format required by the VEC

2) Diskettees and paperwork (which really should be negotiated for
elimination with the FCC for total electronic document interface (EDI)))
could be sent to the VEC. VEC could then ingest into its on-line system

3) The VE should be responsible (and really are de facto if not de iure) for
the validation and verification of format and content. As a result minimum
checking should really be done by the VEC. If everyone has to do everything
again then somehow the system has processing flaws.

4) The validation of the VEs should be handled by a number assigned to the
VE as part of their certification by the VECs.

This process at all levels is still !!!! TOO !!!! manual. It appears as
if the belief is that a manual process is the only way to ensure accuracy
and validity. Just because we haven't automated the WHOLE process before
doesn't mean we can't start doing it now. Very few of the type of people
performing VE service don't have access to a computer. Paper should be
involved only because of the FCC and we should really lobby to automate
their part so we can use EDI when dealing with them.

Erich
N3OXM

Date: 23 Jul 1993 07:59:38 -0400
From: news.cerf.net!crash!newshub.nosc.mil!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!genrad.com!genrad.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CAKyrA.6z7@srgenprp.sr.hp.com> alanb@sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:
>Gene Wolford (genew@techbook.techbook.com) wrote:
>: After mentioning to a friend that the 8 week wait for my
>: ticket had come and gone with no ticket in sight,
>: he sent me the following (caustic) mail.
>: I initially discounted his sarcasm, but, live and learn!
>
>[Rantings and ravings about the ARRL VEC being too slow in processing
>license applications deleted.]
>
>One problem an organization like the ARRL has, is that the more it
>tries to do for its members (and non-members), the greater the chance
>of pissing someone off. Someone should point out that the ARRL does
                          ^^^
>not make a dime on the VEC. This service, offered equally to members

```
 ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>and non-members alike, is subsidized by the ARRL membership.
```

This statement above is absolutely correct. In fact, the last time I was
down at ARRL, they mentioned (in the VEC office) that the fees from the
testing sessions don't even cover the expenses to copy all the forms and tests
(BLANK FORMS) and to process everything (FILLED IN FORMS). That means the
moneys for this are coming out of the membership's back pocket and the
goodwill of the volunteers.

I suspect the story is the same with W5YI and all other VECs.

THANK YOU, ARRL AND W5YI AND ALL THE REST, FOR THE SERVICES YOU PROVIDE.

It would be nice to hear more positive items on this net instead of the
constant code-nocode battles, or the incessant ARRL criticisms and blamings.
I know, that WOULD be asking too much.

Diana L. Carlson
VE, Incoming QSL card sorter, CAP member.
What have you volunteered for recently?

"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."


```
--
->Diana L. (Syriac) Carlson dls@genrad.com     Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea)      <-
->I'D RATHER BE FLYING! P-ASEL, INST      CAP: CPT, Freedom 690 Mobile<-
->AD ASTRA, PER ASPERA                Airplane:  None :-(
        <-
->GenRad, MS/6, 300 Baker Ave, Concord, Mass.  01742  (508)369-4400 x2459   <-
```

Date: 22 Jul 1993 18:20:18 -0400
From: vtserf.cc.vt.edu!csugrad.cs.vt.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: TS50 Illegal!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I've been following this thread about the TS50 with interest. But I seem
to have missed the begining ot it. Would someone please let me
know who make the TS50, so I can get some specs and understand all the
comments. Thanks, much appreciated.

            Joe Reid

--

Joe Reid
jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu   jreid@gnu.ai.mit.edu
rri!jreid@vtserf.cc.vt.edu   vpcjoe@vtcs1.cs.vt.edu
UNIX Systems Administrator, pool player, and professional do-nothing

----

Date: 23 Jul 93 19:44:54 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: VE Test Conditions
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

My coworker Steve Ford posted this for me:

The distasteful reply to John Reece and Howard Lester's comments
that just showed up in this area was not mine.

It was sent out on my terminal by someone else--I'd like to find out
who it was.

My apologies to those who were offended.

Please, let's not start a flame war about this!

--Kirk Kleinschmidt, NT0Z
  QST Assistant Managing Editor
  kirk@arrl.org

Date: 23 Jul 93 20:32:15 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: VE Test Conditions
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:
>In article <1806@arrl.org> kirk@arrl.org (Kirk Kleinschmidt, NT0Z) writes:

>> Oh, pi-- off, you whiners!

> Is this what we can expect in the way of participation from the ARRL in this
> forum?

   OOPS! BIG APOLOGIES! This wasn't intended as a message for the net! I was
testing our connection TO EACH OTHER in the same office, using the LAN, and
inadvertently dumped a "test text" onto the newsgroup! Kirk didn't know a
thing about it and I apologize for it getting "out of the gate," as it were.
(Sometimes running a bunch of stuff on an Ethernet card under Windows gets

kinda confuzing.)

   AGAIN, MAJOR APOLOGIES--this wasn't intended as a reply or for ANYONE on
the newsgroup! And it was (accidentally) "posted" by me, not Kirk. Sporry,
folks...(bending over for a good caning!)

    8-(

CUL es 73 de BB

 ""
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I great frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I
 ""·

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 04:58:42 GMT
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!netcomsv!netcom.com!mjr@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <229cnr$hjg@sun1.clark.net>, <mjrCADt1u.1p7@netcom.com>,
<1993Jul19.133416.2923@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>
Subject : Re: Alinco DJ-580 and New Duckie

In article <1993Jul19.133416.2923@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom
Bodoh) writes:

>I am quite happy with my Anli-800 combination duck and telescoping whip. It
>has a base coil which connects to either a slim duck or the whip. I can't
>transmit yet :-(but it sure made a big difference on receive!
>
Well I've no doubt there are antennas out there that will out perform the Larsen
ducky. But the issue is not just performance but convenience. How often will
you want to be switching antennas back and forth or walking around with the
whip on and fully extended?

--
matthew rapaport   Philosopher/Programmer At Large   KD6KVH
         mjr@netcom.com   70371.255@compuserve.com

Date: 23 Jul 93 16:12:08 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2372@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
>In article <1993Jul21.090935.29250@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>>SMD rework is actually easier than reworking multi-layer through hole
>>boards. The only tools you need are a static hot air source (Pyropen),
>>solder paste, tweezers, and a magnifier. Trying to do it with an ordinary
>>soldering iron, however, will be an exercise in frustration. Once you've
>>learned how to do surface mount rework, you'll hate to have to deal with
>>through hole boards.
>
>   I wholeheartedly disagree. First, when I was working for a startup
>company, the cheapest hot-air source we could find for the purpose was
>$900. Second, although I've been soldering since 1963 with two cold
>solders that I know about to date, I couldn't find a way to get all the
>pins soldered, period, including touchup with a needlepoint soldering iron.
>Third, multilevel boards are not all that hard to deal with; it took me
>fully three days (in the 1970's) to become expert at removing, cleaning
>and replacing parts on ML boards without ruining vias, lifting traces,
>bridging solder points, or any of those hazards, and the solder sucker
>(my particular religion; I _hate_ braid!) cost all of $15.
>   I will agree that UNsoldering SMT parts is easy with the air gun,
>though; but cleaning the pads for new solder paste is a pain, unlike
>cleaning multilevel board holes.
>   Disclaimer: maybe there's something I don't know because the people
>who supplied the air gun and training didn't know it either.

Indeed!

A Pyropen is $39.95 *retail*, and fits in your shirt pocket. It's
trivial to get good SMD joints with it, and SMD parts self align
by surface tension when heated. Naturally there are tricks you have
to master to control the temperature correctly, and good SMD solder
paste is a must. Use of modelling clay dams is a big help in getting
the heat exactly where you want it. Cleaning the pads is easy too,
but you have to use that evil Solderwick. Solderwick isn't really bad
if you keep a bottle of liquid rosin handy to keep it saturated. Then
it really wicks. Remember there are no holes to trap solder on a
surface mount board. You want to leave a light "tin" on the pads
anyway.

Thru hole boards, on the other hand, have gotten cheesier as time

has passed. The professional broadcast still stores and frame syncs
I work on have 8 layer boards that will delaminate if you look at
them wrong, much less bring a soldering iron near them. The traces
are very thin, and the vias are porous. If you use a solder sucker,
you'll come away with a via. :-(Then you have the joy to tacking
in pieces of wirewrap wire to re-establish connections. I've never
had a laminate lift on a surface mount board.

And surface mount boards are much easier to troubleshoot. There
are no hidden connections. All you need is a sharp probe to test
any point in the circuit. I know the standard religion is to never
reuse a SMD after you've removed it from a board, but I've found
you almost never trash a SMD by removing it from the board for
a test, and using silver bearing solder paste eliminates the
leaching problem. On the other hand, removing a DIP from a
thru hole board almost always trashes it. I find I can troubleshoot
and repair a surface mounted circuit faster than I can a thru hole
board.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #896
****